

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN
SOUTHERN DIVISION

GWAN JUN KIM,

Plaintiff,

Case No. 1:06-CV-683

v.

Hon. Robert J. Jonker

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
et al,

Defendants.

ORDER

Defendant's motion to determine the sufficiency of plaintiff's answers to defendants' First Requests for Admissions (docket 200) was heard by the court on February 14, 2008. For the reasons stated on the record at that hearing, the motion was GRANTED in part, and the court finds as follows:

- A. Plaintiff is required to file new and appropriate responses, pursuant to Rule 36, to Requests to Admit nos. 5, 17, 18, 19, 22, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 37, 50, 51, 52, 53 and 54.
- B. Plaintiff shall file a new response to Request to Admit no. 13 explaining his denial.
- C. Wherever plaintiff has answered "yes" to a Request to Admit, this was intended to be an admission under the rule. Accordingly, Requests to Admit nos. 25, 31 and 43 are deemed ADMITTED, and any words following the word "yes" in those answers are stricken as surplusage.

D. Requests to Admit nos. 6, 14, 15, 16, 20, 21, 23, 24, 34, 38, 41, 48, 55 and 56 are deemed ADMITTED.

E. Plaintiff's responses to Requests to Admit nos. 10, 12, 33, 36, 44, 45 and 49 are deemed to be DENIALS.

F. Plaintiff's responses to Requests to Admit nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 11, 39 and 40 are deemed sufficient.

All answers required by this order are due within ten (10) business days of the date of the hearing.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: February 20, 2008

/s/ Hugh W. Brenneman, Jr.
HUGH W. BRENNEMAN, JR.
United States Magistrate Judge